

## Temperance Against Prohibition

BY HENRY MAURICE

OF the many curious fads which in our day occupy the public's mind, the prohibition fad seems at the present moment to have outdistanced all others in its efforts to attract general attention. That there are numerous weak links in our social armor is obvious: divorce, neo-malthusianism, peculiar business methods, and inordinate love of pleasure, lawful or otherwise, are playing havoc with our citizens. Yet while this is apparent to all, at the same time little or no serious effort is being made in the non-Catholic world to correct these fundamental evils of American life. On the contrary, the camels of iniquity are allowed a clear field and all the favors, while a most ardent chase is always in progress after the unfortunate, and much less dangerous gnats.

Thus it comes that the Decalogue is no longer up to date. "Thou shalt not kill," in certain contingencies, is of less moment than "Thou shalt not drink wine"; "Thou shalt not commit adultery," is on a par with "Thou shalt not use tobacco"; whereas "Thou shalt not steal" appears of less consequence to a class of reformers than "Thou shalt not play Sunday baseball." This list of man-made commandments might be prolonged indefinitely merely by glancing over one of the slang-exhibits called sermons of a modern "evangelist."

But for the present I am more concerned with the prohibition precept than with the other freak substitutes, now in vogue, for the code of Mount Sinai. The latest

State in which an attempt is being made to join the procession, strangely enough, is the steady, conservative old Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. For a few days ago a Constitutional Amendment of the following tenor was introduced in the House of Representatives at Harrisburg, where the State legislature is now in session: "The manufacture, sale, barter, or exchange of intoxicating liquors or beverages, whether spirituous, vinous, malt or brewed, is hereby forever prohibited." Should this amendment be adopted the procuring of wine for the Holy Sacrifice would be rendered impossible in Pennsylvania, and we should have reached the advanced stage of "progress" now being enjoyed in that enlightened infant among States, Arizona. It is scarcely probable, indeed, that in the Keystone State we have yet arrived at the degree of perfection necessary for the acceptance of a measure so well calculated to put us, while still on earth, in the third, if not in the seventh heaven. But at all events we have made a beginning, and the village Hampden, who has thus immortalized his name, may yet live to see a statue erected in his honor on the banks of the Kishquoquillas. Meanwhile he will have the eminent satisfaction of being the hero of innumerable spinster gatherings, perhaps even a keen rival in the rural communities of this Commonwealth of the immortal statesman who discovered grape juice as the most potent nurture of the dove of peace.

Now, that there is urgent need of legislation, to prevent the grave abuses connected with the manufacture and sale of intoxicants in the United States, is manifest. But our chief national characteristic in law-making seems to be an inordinate love of extremes. I suppose most of our States, for instance, have passably good liquor laws. Are

these ever seriously enforced? A year or two ago, in a city which shall be nameless, through the efforts of the District-Attorney, there was brought to light a condition of things which had existed in several hotels for a number of years and which was simply appalling. The public was shocked, naturally enough, and the prohibition stock in consequence went up several hundred per cent. But it did not seem to occur to anybody that if the police had been doing their duty the condition deplored so rightly would never have existed. And why did not the police do their duty? Simply because they were inefficient. The chief qualification required in their selection was ability to get votes. Moreover, their appointment was only for the term of a mayor; their reappointment depended upon their usefulness to the candidate of their choice at the next election; and consequently they dared not, if they would, enforce the law in the case of the low saloon-keepers, whose influence is so useful at the hustings. Of course, the remedy for this vicious circle is known to all: Civil Service. Nobody, however, reformers included, would dream of advocating the adoption of this corrective, and therefore, instead, we decided to make the last state worse than the first.

I have often wondered what the average present-day Protestant church-member really thinks of Our Lord's action in changing water into wine. And when you remember that the quantity of water thus affected at Cana of Galilee was simply enormous, not less than 84, and possibly as many as 162 gallons, according to the "measure" used, then my curiosity increases. I say the *individual* Protestant church-member, for it is perfectly clear that if Christ were on earth at this moment and, let us say, while attending a wedding in the foreign section

of Philadelphia, changed water into wine, the very last drop of the vials of Billy Sunday's wrath would be poured out in denunciation of the Son of Man. Of course, such a thought as this never occurs to the well-meaning and, after his manner, sincere and pious Prohibitionist. But this does not alter the fact that Our Lord on earth to-day, after such a miracle as that at the marriage feast, would be denied membership in most Protestant churches from Maine to Florida. Is it necessary even to hint at the family resemblance between this point of view and that of the rigid observers of the law, who were so severely denounced by Christ nineteen centuries ago? And is it necessary, in addition, to say that Our Saviour's rebukes of pharisaism have met with the unanimous approval of the world ever since?

Now these vagaries of well-meaning men and women would be amusing enough were not the consequences of their irrationalism so serious. In the first place the extremes to which they incline at once alienate millions of moderate citizens who would gladly cooperate with them in an effort to obtain reasonable reforms. Practically all Catholics, for instance, would approve of placing every useful restriction on the sale of drink, and of the strictest enforcement of the laws enacted to this end. But, just at the outset we are met with an impossible program which would prevent us from saying Mass, and which in consequence is radically anti-Christian. Is it not high time that sensible men of good will should organize and give a quietus to this midsummer madness which is nowadays called "reform?" The success thus far achieved by the radical fanatics is, I think, chiefly due to one cause, namely, that nobody wants to come out as an advocate of what the prohibitionists would stigmatize as

"the liquor interests." But what I would propose is just the reverse of this. I would, in the first place, abolish the present type of bar altogether, and permit wines and light beers to be distributed only in restaurants. In the second place I would, if anybody particularly wanted it, prohibit the manufacture of all other liquors altogether, though personally I think it would be preferable to allow the sale of these with restrictions; I would never, for example, allow them to be consumed on the premises. This I consider a practical program of temperance reform, which would go far toward a real solution of the liquor problem. But, on the other hand, if the fanatics get their way through the supineness of the moderate element in American public life, I greatly fear, first, that national prohibition is only a matter of time, and secondly, that, as a consequence, a quarter of a century hence will see the United States a nation of drug-fiends.

#### SOME LETTERS PRO AND CON

*Which the Editor of "America" Received on the Prohibition Question.*

*To the Editor of "America":*

The exceptionally clear, comprehensive, and dispassionate presentation of the subject of "Temperance against Prohibition," which appears in your issue of March 6, deserves the widest possible publicity. It is an appeal not merely to "sensible men of good will," to whom it is directly addressed, but also to those who may, perhaps, neither claim nor deserve that meritorious designation. All men of intelligence should recognize to what serious extent their rights and personal liberty are jeopardized by prohibition, that most pernicious type of folly, which is well characterized by the author of the article as "midsummer madness," and is now rampant under the gross misnomer of "re-

form." However far the condition of society in the "dark ages" may have been inferior to the exalted civilization which so called "reformers" claim for the present day, the "dark ages" can not, at least, be denied the merit of having been exempt from the perversions of intellect and the errors of intention which are to-day manifested in "Higher Criticism," "Christian Science," "Socialism," and last, but by no means least, "Prohibition."

That a very large percentage of those who are seeking to inflict prohibition upon this nation are thoroughly honest, conscientious, and actuated by the worthiest motives, is undeniable; but they have either been ignorant of the actual conditions which bear upon the question of how best to promote the cause of true temperance, or have been deceived by the misrepresentations of a small minority, consisting of paid agitators. These agitators make it a matter of business to gain their subsistence by efforts to convert the well-meant intentions of the advocates of temperance into a fanaticism which ignores the rights, not only of "the liquor interests," but also of all other citizens, and which, as has been shown in numerous instances, increases, instead of diminishing, the evils which it claims, in season and out of season, that it is intended to prevent. The acme of trespass upon personal liberty and constitutional rights has been reached in the recent enactment of prohibition legislation in Arizona, under which the practice of the Catholic religion in that State has actually been made contrary to law. And unless the "moderate element in American public life," mentioned by the author of the article to which I have referred, as well as the voters who can move that element to proper action, stem the tide of folly and fanaticism, similar legislation will elsewhere be enacted, and the author's belief that "a quarter of a century hence will see the United States a nation of drug-fiends," will find its realization in the degradation of our country.

No law has ever been made, and no law ever can be made and enforced which will prevent the indulgence of a natural appetite, which, within proper bounds, is neither improper nor harmful; and one of the many detrimental results of legislation to that end has been to inculcate in the minds of many, whose rights have been trespassed upon, a demoralizing contempt for law in general. The regulation of the liquor traffic, and the prevention

of the serious injury resultant upon the abuse of liquors, is, however, entirely practicable, and legislation to that effect would be enforceable without involving confiscation of property, violation of vested rights, or undue limitation of the personal liberty of the citizen. Moreover, "the liquor interests" would not only not oppose such legislation, but would find it to their advantage to give their active support to its enforcement. Unfortunately, however, regulation would not redound to the advertising schemes of the self-constituted "reformers." But it should not for that reason fail to receive the hearty support of every one who advocates the only approach to prohibition that would be either right or effective, *i. e.*, the regulation of the sale and use of liquors by such fair and reasonable legislation as will command the approval and support of all who are advocates of temperance. Regulation can prevent a man from injuring himself and society by excess; but even if it should fail to do so, a stupefied and helpless drunkard is a less dangerous element than a drug-crazed and murderous maniac.

New York.

J. SNOWDEN BELL.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

Intemperance can not be checked and prohibition averted by the means and methods of the article "Temperance against Prohibition" in *America* of March 6. Drink is not the gnat some would imply; it takes more than a gnat to arouse the self-sacrificing enthusiasm that possesses the advocates of prohibition, and urges them to unreasonable extremes. Men do not lose their reason for a gnat. If this "gnat" were strained out, the "camels of iniquity" would shrink to very diminutive dimensions. Superintendents of penal and charitable institutions state that drink, directly or indirectly, brings nine-tenths of the inmates to these institutions; and bishops attribute to the same source nine-tenths of the trouble they have in the administration of their office. My experience of thirty-nine years in the priesthood, of more than thirty years as an active member of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America, and of twelve years in the Priests' Total Abstinence League, and as an officer in both Associations for the same length of time, corroborates the testimony of these civil and ecclesiastical magistrates.

The urgent need of legislation to prevent the abuses connected with the manufacture and sale of intoxicants in the United States is far from manifest, unless we are prepared to accept the contention of those who advocate prohibition; nor is it clear that practical Catholics generally would approve of the strictest enforcement of such legislation. Appealing to legislation for the cure of every evil is the great mistake of the day. There is entirely too much legislation. What is needed is the enforcement or the repeal of the laws we have. Enforcement of the law does not depend wholly on the police; it must have as its foundation respect for law and authority. Too much has been written by those who profess to fear that Catholic temperance workers may go too far, that readily lends itself to quotation against genuine temperance work and in favor of drinking. The Church has ever insisted on respect for law and authority; and if her admonitions in regard to temperance had been as generally observed as they are neglected, it would have reacted favorably on the public, intemperance would have been kept under fairly good control, and the movement for prohibition might not have been inaugurated or at least not have acquired its present momentum. The movement, however, is not going to be overcome by ridicule and pleasantry, but it may be directed by sympathetic reasoning; for these people are desperately in earnest, even if their zeal is unreasonable. But the continuation of the Mass does not depend on this movement being overcome or controlled; though if it is not controlled, Catholics may be inconvenienced in some places. But who will be to blame? If Catholics had followed the admonitions of the Church, such danger would not have arisen.

Pastors were told by the Council of Baltimore to keep their people away from the saloon, and to get such of them as were in the dangerous liquor business out of it, and to make every effort to root out the vice of intemperance which gives scandal to non-Catholics and is both an obstacle to the spread of the true religion and a perpetual incentive to sin. They were never to cease crying out against the vice and whatever leads to it; for to them the Council looked for the spread of sobriety. The late Pontiff hoped that not only bishops, priests and men of religious Orders, but also laymen, would become members of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America, since those who abstain



entirely from all intoxicating drink are worthy of all praise. Priests especially should be conspicuous as models of abstinence. As regards the laity, the Council declares the zeal of total abstainers to be according to knowledge, and commends their societies to the fatherly care of pastors. Those who can not get out of the dangerous business must not sell on Sundays, nor to minors, nor to those who they foresee will abuse drink; and they must not allow sinful language in their places of business. Much more might be cited from Councils and Pontiffs, both as regards priests and people. If these admonitions had been conscientiously followed, conditions would be such as to preclude the danger the writer of the article apprehends from prohibition. To follow these admonitions and induce their readers to follow them should be the work of Catholic writers and leaders, instead of ridiculing and denouncing the extravagances of those who have not an infallible teacher and guide.

Scottsdale, Pa.

M. A. LAMBING.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

More power to the writers of the articles "Temperance Against Prohibition" in your esteemed review! They are on the right road. . . . Prohibition is *ineffective* against the evils of drunkenness. It is based upon the fallacy that not rational men, but irrational creatures, are responsible for the evils of our times. As a factor in morality, prohibition has proved a dismal failure everywhere. Federal statistics and court records show that, on the average and in proportion to population, there is more drunkenness, vice, crime, misdemeanor, poverty, divorce and insanity in dry territory than in wet territory. Maine with her sixty years of prohibition "blessings" has been marching at the head of the States with a high divorce rate. The Portland *Argus*, quoted by the Bangor *Daily News* for May 14, 1914, stated that, according to official reports, the number of arrests for drunkenness in "dry" Portland, Maine, during 1913, was over 4,000, or one arrest for this offence to every fifteen inhabitants. According to the *Daily News* for March 17, 1914, the number of arrests for drunkenness in Bangor, during 1913, was exactly 2,152, or one arrest for the same offence to every eleven inhabitants. The number of arrests for drunkenness was, there-

fore, a great deal larger in Portland and Bangor than in "wet" Pittsburgh. Out of thirty large cities in our country, extra dry Memphis, Tenn., had during nine years the highest murder rate, while human life was safest in extra-wet Milwaukee. This has been proved by the statistician Frederick Hoffman, in a recent issue of the *Spectator*.

There are many well-meaning people at the head of the prohibition movement. This does not prove that they are right. A man may champion an error with the same sincerity with which he defends a truth. The dry agitators obstinately confound the use with the abuse, temperance and total abstinence with prohibition, though all these conceptions are vitally different. Temperance means use in moderation, while prohibition is the forbidding by civil law of the manufacture, sale and use of alcoholic beverages. Total abstinence is the habitual and voluntary refraining from all intoxicating beverages. No priest who celebrates Mass can be a total abstainer. It is unfair to marshal the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore into the ranks of the prohibitionist. The Fathers called the liquor traffic *quæstus in se non illicitus*, a business not in itself unlawful. They warned against the *abuse* of the liquor traffic and against the evils resulting from the abuse. Let us stand for the strict regulation, not for the abolition, of the liquor traffic. The prohibition bugaboo has done more harm than good. Let us ship the water-wagon back to Turkey!

Mannington, W. Va.

C. J. KLUSER.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

I have been reading with much interest the "Prohibition" articles that are appearing in your columns. No, not with interest. They are the same old articles by the advocates of "moderate" drinking and "strict" regulation that we are reading everywhere these days. These articles are written by the same class of people who were howling their heads off in the days before the Civil War about the immorality of abolition, the well-fed people who sit at their desks and spin theories, but who know nothing about the real problems of life. They fear confiscation of saloon property, but they give never a thought to the confiscation of the wages of the poor fellows who have to run the

gauntlet of the saloons on their way home from work every night. These hair-splitters are all wrought up over the fear that we may become a nation of drug fiends if our "light drinks" are taken away from us, and in the same breath they have the effrontery to refer to other people as "fanatics." My advice to them is to throw the statistics of the liquor dealers' associations into the waste-basket and take a trip through the State of Kansas. Not a Pullman-car trip, but one that will take them among the people. Better still, let them visit the Catholic communities of the State, and if they can find a more contented people, I would like to hear from them. I never knew a man to go into Kansas with an open mind that didn't come out with his ideas against prohibition severely jolted.

For the past twelve years I have traveled the country from Indiana to Texas and from Texas to North Dakota, and I know something about wet and dry conditions from actual experience. I know the change for the better that has been wrought in many communities that have had the courage to introduce prohibition. The man who says that prohibition means drug-fiends doesn't know the first thing about the subject from the practical standpoint. He is a mere spinner of theories, nothing else. Prohibition does inconvenience some people for a while, it usually rids a community of an element that can well be spared, but the good outweighs the inconvenience a hundred times over. Christianity bids the strong help the weak. The man who says he can leave drink alone without any trouble should leave it alone for the benefit of the weaker brother who can not. "Lead us not into temptation." But, then, we handle very few of our problems from a Christian standpoint.

It is all very well for the man who can take his drink at his club to tell us about the great moral issues at stake; but the fact remains that alcohol is made to be sold, and it is going to be sold, law or no law. In the meantime, while the doctors are splitting hairs, we are ruining young men and old men by the thousands. If the author of "Temperance against Prohibition" can show a wet city in the United States that has not an acute saloon problem, a city where alcohol is not either the dominant or a strong factor in politics, I would like to visit it. He can talk about "civil service" and "regulation" until "the cows come

home." He might just as well talk about regulating the devil. So long as liquor is allowed to be sold, it will seep through any wall erected against it. Sisseton, S. D., conceived the idea, a few years ago, of a municipal saloon under the direct supervision of the authorities. Sisseton kept the saloon one year, then gave it up. For years we have been fed on the "regulation" of the "light wine" districts of Europe, but the war brought us the news that the wine-drinking Frenchman had gone to absinthe. Like all beer and light wine drinkers, he found he needed something stronger occasionally to get the "kick." And did not the Government of France give that "beverage" the Kansas treatment?

The intemperate drinker is not the only problem. The "moderate" drinker is a problem as well. There is not a moderate drinker of my acquaintance who can afford to spend \$100 a year for drink; yet that is only about twenty cents a day: a small amount for the average drinker. The men in ordinary circumstances who spend more than that are legion. And what is worse, the "moderate" drinker as a rule always has an ache of some kind or other. He is never just right. He must have his bracer in the morning; his cocktail for an appetizer; his *crème de menthe* for a settler; a drink of gin for his kidneys, and a night-cap to induce sleep. Tell him that he is a drinker and he becomes indignant. He talks about "personal liberty" and "fanatics." In his estimation only "cranks" think that the liquor laws should be rigidly enforced. He can abstain whenever he wishes, but when he wants a drink he should be able to get it. He blames everything under the sun when he is short of cash or not in fit condition; but he never blames the alcohol.

Now, I am no more in favor of prohibitory laws than any one else; but I am sick and tired of this eternal compromising with an evil that has touched too many families, an evil that has retarded the work of the Church in the United States more than any other thing. I have talked and worked for "regulation," but I am through with that. It looks nice on paper; but it's a fraud. The great majority of men would never think of taking a drink if it wasn't under their nose all the time; and that is the class of men who intend to get rid of alcohol. It is not the "fanatics"; it is not the "reformers." It is the men who know from actual

experience what the evils of drink are. I do not think the religious element entered into the passage of the Arizona law. Lack of foresight brought on the quandary about the Mass. Mormon Utah is liable to do anything to other religions; but what that State does should not be held up as an example, any more than the action of the Arkansas legislature in passing a convent inspection bill should be held up as an example of what other States are going to do. Prohibition laws have been passed in fifteen or more other States, and Mass is being said legally in every one of them. Instead of acting as a brake on the wheel, we should see to it that our rights are properly safeguarded.

Christ, for some good reason of His own, blessed wine for the wedding guests; but the man who tries to reconcile liquor drinking as we know it to-day with that act of the Saviour's is hard put for excuses. The wine of Cana is not strong enough to flavor American alcohol.

Omaha.

J. J. FITZGERALD.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

Regarding the two writers who disagree with my views on the subject of prohibition, I must say in general terms that they both ignore the real question and waste valuable space dealing with side issues. The question before us is whether it is not more wise from the standpoint of statesmanship and good citizenship to encourage, by means of all the moral forces left in our country, the cardinal virtue of temperance rather than adopt stringent laws, which nobody will ever dream of seriously enforcing, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the United States. My contention is: (1) that our present liquor laws are altogether too lax; (2) that, weak as they are, they are not properly enforced, because (3) our law officers in every city in the land are the ephemeral creatures of the lowest grade of politicians.

Father Lambing suggests that the prohibition movement "may be directed by sympathetic reasoning." But how in the name of common sense are we to direct, by sympathetic reasoning or any other kind of reasoning, people who, according to him, have lost their reason? What he has to say about Pius X and the Third

Plenary Council has no bearing on the case; the late venerated Pope and the Council of Baltimore, like all Popes and all Councils for some nineteen centuries, approved and encouraged the admirable, but voluntary virtue of self-denial; which is just a bit different from compulsory prohibition.

Your second correspondent who objects to my position, Mr. Fitzgerald, appears to think I belong to the great school of closet philosophers, and that consequently I have no practical experience of "the problems of real life." Let me reassure him on this point: I am not in the least degree a hermit. "Alcohol is made to be sold, and is going to be sold, law or no law!" Why, that is just my contention. And to show him how true his confident affirmation is, let me cite a few facts. The number of illicit distilleries found in the United States in the year 1913 was merely 2,374, whereas the registered distilleries totaled 821. Further, 80 per cent. of the former class of alcohol producers were discovered in the prohibition States of Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi and the Carolinas. This is a pretty fair indication that alcohol will be made and sold, "law or no law."

The "practical" Mr. Fitzgerald also assures me that anybody who says prohibition "means drug-fiends doesn't know the first thing about the subject from the practical standpoint." Really I am awfully ashamed at my total want of the "practical" sense. Yet I find that the Clinical Director of the Georgia State Sanitarium reports a "steady increase in insanity from the use of drugs in the last five years in Georgia," and in particular an increase "of more than 700 per cent. in the first two months of 1914."

Even as regards that American Utopia, the State of Kansas, there seem to be differences of opinion. For instance, a correspondent of the *New York Sun*, writing from San Bernardino, Cal., under date of February 9, tells of an experience he had in a Kansas town of some 20,000 inhabitants, last New Year's Eve. This traveler, Mr. W. H. Wright, says that in the course of the last evening of the Old Year he looked around for some of the usual features that mark such an occasion; but all was quiet, "just deadly quiet." The following morning he inquired the reason for so peculiar a way of ushering in the New Year and received this explanation: "The people of this State," the

hotel proprietor informed him, "are licked, just licked, that is all there is to it. There are so many laws against everything, and so many busybodies prying about trying to convict somebody of something that people have lost all heart and can not even shout. They have become callous to all emotions whatever."

Another claim advanced with confidence by Mr. Fitzgerald is that "the great majority of men would never think of taking a drink if it wasn't under their nose all the time." Let us see. The number of illicit distilleries noted above as existing in the Southern prohibition States in 1913 seems to me to indicate that if people do not find liquor "under their nose" they are willing to take some pains to get in a position so alluring, unlawfully. Moreover, I am informed by a pamphlet of former United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Royal E. Cabell, that in one year the Southern Express Co. alone shipped over six million gallons of whiskey *directly to consumers* in dry territory. Do these figures sustain Mr. Fitzgerald's contention? Of course he tells me to throw all such statistics, got out by wicked men, into the waste-basket, a very convenient way, and the usual way of the prohibitionist, of disposing of an argument.

Finally, let Mr. Fitzgerald get this into his mind once and for all: that people who take my point of view are far and away from being friends of the American saloon. On the contrary we despise and detest it in its existing form, as a corrupting institution. But we oppose prohibition because we believe there is ample reason to fear that it will make bad immeasurably worse. I find nothing in the correspondence with which I have been dealing to induce me to modify this opinion.

Harrisburg, Pa.

HENRY MAURICE.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

Will you permit me, a priest, to make some remarks on this question of "Temperance vs. Prohibition," which has been opened up in the pages of *America*? Human rights, howsoever humble, are sacred, especially when they are chartered in the Bible. We can not afford to let any real right of man be minimized or be taken from him. The prohibitionists are assailing one right of man, and the eugenists are sharpening their weapons to take away one or two others. When I hear men denouncing drink

as if it were in itself an evil and speaking of total abstinence as if it were a matter of obligation, there rises before my mind the example of Our Divine Lord at the wedding in Cana, and the example too, I may say, of His Blessed Mother, who requested the wine for the guests which He so plentifully gave them. (John ii: 1-11.)

There comes also before my mind Our Lord's words to the Jewish people: "John came neither eating nor drinking; and they say: He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say: Behold a man that is a glutton and a wine drinker, a friend of publicans and sinners. And wisdom is justified by her children." (Matt. xi: 18, 19.) Certainly Our Lord knew the evils that would flow from intemperance. Yet He did not command us to abstain from wine. "Touch not, taste not, handle not" (Col. ii: 21) is a favorite quotation of certain persons who look with disfavor on the use of wine; but if they examine that verse in the light of its context, they may not quote it any more. Our Lord knew also the benefits to be derived by millions from the proper use of this gift of God to men, and He would not deprive them of it; and His example, higher than which we can not have, would seem to have been set up against all who would rob man of this liberty.

Total abstinence is very good, and for some necessary, as every confessor knows. He who marries does well. At least we hope so. He who marries not does better, provided his motives are proper. So too is it with the man who likes his glass of wine, and with the total abstainer who prefers his glass of water. But the Bible is not a cold water tract. The Bible condemns intemperance, but it does not command total abstinence. It holds the golden mean. "Wine drunken with excess raiseth quarrels, and wraths, and many ruins." (Ecclus. xxxi: 38.) Grape-juice certainly wouldn't do that. "Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thy frequent infirmities." (I Tim. v: 23.) "Wine may cheer the heart of man." (Ps. ciii: 15.) "Give wine to them that are grieved in mind." (Prov. xxxi: 6.) "Wine was created from the beginning to make men joyful, and not to make them drunk. Wine drunken with moderation is the joy of the soul and the heart." (Ecclus. xxxi: 35, 36.) Grape-juice wouldn't do any of those things either. Not in the Bible will certain of the



Prohibitionists find what they are looking for. They will find it, however, in the Koran.

Father Lambing says in his article in *America* of March 20 (p. 565), that "superintendents of penal and charitable institutions state that drink, directly or indirectly, brings nine-tenths of the inmates to these institutions." I do not now question the correctness of the superintendents' estimate; but it is obvious that those nine-tenths in penal and charitable institutions are not nine-tenths of humanity. Shall the rest of humanity therefore be deprived of their use of a thing because some abuse it? Father Lambing also says, "Bishops attribute to the same source nine-tenths of the trouble they have in the administration of their office!" But nine-tenths of their trouble, surely, is not nine-tenths of their priests and their people! What of the Bishop of bishops? What was the cause of nine-tenths of the troubles of Pius X? Was Modernism, for example, and the carrying out of the decree *Quam singulari* only one-tenth of his troubles? Was it drink or was it heresy that vexed the pontificates of Paul III and Pius IV? And so on, back through the ages of the Church, has it been drink or has it been pride that has done the greater harm to souls?

Intemperance is bad. And some other things are bad; some other things are worse. Gluttony is only one of the capital sins. Anger, avarice, envy, lust, pride, sloth, are others. It isn't the love of drink, but the love of money, that St. Paul styles "the root of all evils." (I Tim. vi: 10.) Judas fell by avarice, not by drink. "By the envy of the devil, death came into the world." (Wisdom ii: 24.) It was not the fury of drink, but the fury of envy, that delivered Our Lord to be crucified: "For he knew that for envy they had delivered him." (Matt. xxvii: 18.)

And then there is sloth! Ordinary laziness! You know the proverbs: "An idle brain is the devil's workshop." And: "Some temptations come to the industrious, but all temptations come to the idle." "The continuation of the Mass does not depend on this movement being overcome or controlled," says Father Lambing. What of Arizona? What of the Mass in the whole country if prohibition of the Arizona kind should become nationwide? "Who will be to blame?" inquires Father Lambing; and he implies that Catholics will. But prohibitionists also, Father Lam-

bing. Two wrongs, as you well know, do not make a right. Imagine the fanaticism that would make Holy Mass impossible by forbidding wine even for sacramental purposes!

No doubt our lamented Holy Father, Pius X, regarded the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America as worthy of all praise. So do many priests, though they do not all choose to become members of the organization. The Church stands for sobriety, yes. She stands also for truth and for liberty, and she would expect every one of her priests to be ready to give up his life, if necessary, in defence of them. The right to take a drink of wine may seem a small thing; but it is a right, nevertheless, when one can use it without sin. Put that right under the guillotine and other rights will soon have to mount the stairs and suffer a like fate. Finally, it is no small thing, but a monstrous thing, to stand between a priest and his right and duty of offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, as prohibitionists have done in Arizona, and as they have planned to do in other places.

San Francisco, Cal.

A SUBSCRIBER.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

Mr. Maurice says that I ignore the real question; that his contention is: (1) that our present liquor laws are altogether too lax. He would abolish our present type of bar, and permit wines and light beers to be sold only in restaurants; and if anybody particularly wanted it, he would prohibit the manufacture of all other liquors altogether, notwithstanding that by doing so he would "trespass upon a fundamental human right." He considers that such a program of temperance reform would be practical and go far toward a real solution of the liquor problem. To a person who has given much study to the problem it does not seem so easily solved as that. At the first C. T. A. U. of A. convention that I attended, in Chicago in 1884, Bishop Ireland showed that a wine and beer license was not practical. Would not permitting manufacturers of liquors to sell or deliver to licensed retailers only, be a better program? It would abolish Saturday night and Sunday drinking in homes, boarding houses and clubs. Saloons are bad enough, but clubs and the delivery of liquor to private houses are worse. This plan would seem to

be more practical than his and would appear not to trespass, as his does, "upon a fundamental human right." For any one by going to the retailer could get a drink if entitled to it, which would be more practical than having to go to a restaurant; and I believe it would go farther toward solving the liquor problem than his, though neither of them would go very far in that direction.

As long as the Catholic Church had control of the Latin countries and the Philippines they had no liquor problem; and if the admonitions of the Second and Third Plenary Councils of Baltimore and of the late Pontiffs were followed, they would go very far toward solving the liquor problem in this country. My plan is to follow them, and no other plan will succeed so well; and unless it is followed, national prohibition is only a question of time.

He contends (2) that our liquor laws are not properly enforced, which I suppose no one will deny; but he may not be assigning the real reason of their non-enforcement. For (3) that "our law officers in every city of the land are the ephemeral creatures of the lowest grade of politicians" is a rather sweeping assertion; it may have too many exceptions to prove true. As to his "idea in brief"; since he is prepared, if anybody wants it, to prohibit the manufacture of all other alcoholic liquors except wines and light beers, although it would be "compulsory prohibition" and, according to him, "trespass upon a fundamental human right," and since "we most certainly" would not enforce the law, his idea seems of very little if any worth.

Mr. Maurice would prohibit altogether the manufacture of all alcoholic liquors except wines and light beers if anybody particularly wanted it. This is more than I would do. I have said somewhere that local option will not solve the liquor problem, and that total abstinence is the ideal for the individual and prohibition for the country, but I have limited my activities to the former and such legislation as I thought would favor it. But if any one hopes to solve the problem by legislation short of country-wide "prohibition of the manufacture of alcoholic liquors except for medical and sacramental purposes," he is doomed to disappointment, if I know anything about the matter, and after thirty years' study I should. I have not advocated prohibition, but I have tried to make people understand that it is not against

the teachings of the Catholic Church; for I believe there is a danger ahead that has not been publicly recognized so far as I am aware. I am not a theologian, but I have been teaching catechism for fifty years, a dozen different kinds, from that of Trent down, and have failed to find in any of them that to "prohibit the manufacture of alcoholic liquors except for medicinal and sacramental purposes" is contrary to Catholic teachings. If it were in any of them, half a century's teaching should have found it. I have no reason to suspect that the Catholic Church forbids prohibition; perhaps the day will come when it will advocate it. But whether it comes or not, those who advocate it should be treated charitably.

Scottdale, Pa.

M. A. LAMBING.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

Mr. Maurice contends that our liquor laws are lax (in his original article he said, "Most of our States have passably good liquor laws"), that they are not properly enforced, and that our law officers in every city in the land are the creatures of low-grade politicians. I know nothing about Pennsylvania; but the liquor laws of our Western States are not lax. We have legislated on everything from free lunch to high license in our attempts to "regulate" the liquor traffic. I will agree that our liquor laws are not rigidly enforced; but the failure is due not so much to our law officers as to the fact that the open sale of liquor weakens the moral forces of a community. It was only last week that a fine young Catholic business man, who dared to come out in the open in a local option fight, informed me that he was waited on by a committee of liquor dealers who told him that he must either pull out of the fight or suffer a loss of business. "There's the rub." Men otherwise courageous quake with fear when they are asked to take a stand against the encroachments of the liquor traffic. Law officers can not be expected to do their duty under such conditions. To quote Archbishop Ireland ("The Saloon") "It is a manifest, though a most lamentable, fact that the liquor influence in the cities of America makes void of effect restrictive liquor legislation, and establishes the violation of law as the normal condition of affairs." Take liquor out of our cities and men will be able to see straight.

But Mr. Maurice tells us that he, too, is opposed to the saloon. He says it is a "corrupting institution." And to cure the evil, he would change its name to "restaurant" and "permit wines and light beers to be distributed." He would *prohibit* the manufacture of other liquors if anybody wanted it; but he would prefer their sale under restrictions if not consumed on the premises. And he says he is practical. Why, doesn't he know that one of the worst evils we have is the liquor-selling restaurant? It is there that drinking is made "respectable." It is there that the girl learns to drink. A certain Chicago restaurant is advertising the fact that it does not serve liquors; and there will be more such restaurants. It is very evident that Mr. Maurice has never lived in a town where the bottle trade is good, or he would not offer as a solution of the problem the "not-to-be-consumed-on-the-premises" remedy.

To prove his contention that prohibition doesn't prohibit, Mr. Maurice avoids the States where it has been given some kind of a trial, and takes us statistically to the "moonshine" districts of the South, among illiterate negroes, and a backward class of whites who religiously believe that they have a right to make their own whiskey. Surely he doesn't want us to take him seriously. "Moonshining" in the Southern mountains was a problem before Mr. Maurice was born, and it will continue to be a problem until the people engaged in it are raised to a higher level. The mere fact that the illicit still is almost wholly confined to a few States in the South is evidence in itself that it has nothing to do with question of prohibition. I do not know the South, but I understand that prohibition laws have been passed there to keep liquor away from the negro, who should not be allowed to use it under any conditions. That being true, Mr. Maurice's six million gallons are easily accounted for. The whites do not want prohibition for themselves.

Cities and States that have given prohibition a fair trial seldom or never go back into the wet column. If prohibition were such a failure as is claimed, this would not be true. The official records of Mitchell, South Dakota, show 158 arrests during the "dry" period from July 1, 1908 to April 15, 1909. Of these 48 were for drunkenness and 67 for vagrancy, as against 462 arrests during the "wet" period from July 1, 1909, to April 15, 1910, of

which 258 were for drunkenness and 101 for vagrancy. Mitchell is again in the "dry" column, and I predict it will stay there. The Chicago *Tribune* of March 28 carries a Washington dispatch quoting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Peters to the effect that "the revenue from whiskey has shrunk over \$2,000,000 a year." On account of decreased consumption of liquor the Government has found it necessary to discharge some of its employees in the Peoria distilleries. A large Ohio brewery failed recently and gave as a reason decreased consumption by the Southern trade. These are just a few of the straws that show which way the wind is blowing. Let Mr. Maurice turn his eyes on some of the successes of prohibition for a while instead of eternally picking out the failures.

Kansas is a State where most of the people believe in prohibition, and where an attempt is made to enforce the laws. I would not say that no liquor is consumed in the State: the mail-order houses of "wet" Missouri are still in business; but I do maintain that there is far less liquor consumed in Kansas *per capita* than in any "wet" State in the country; and I maintain, furthermore, that the beneficial effects of prohibition are in evidence everywhere in the State. *America* could be filled with a list of them. For my part, in two years' travel, I never saw a drunken man in Kansas. I have a pretty good pair of eyes, and when I first traveled the State, I was looking for "abuses." But why go farther? No better argument for prohibition could be offered than the statement of Mr. Wright, as quoted by Mr. Maurice, that in a Kansas city of 20,000 inhabitants, he couldn't find the "usual features" that mark the mustering in of the New Year: there was no drunken orgy such as disgraces our cities every year much to the pecuniary benefit of hotel keepers. The citizens of Wichita, Topeka and Hutchinson—one of these must be the city referred to—breathe the air of a free State, and are in the habit of taking their pleasures after the manner of Christians. They are not dominated by "big business, bad politics and booze" as are the citizens of Pennsylvania, if we are to believe *Collier's* of April 24.

In his original article, Mr. Maurice predicted that as a consequence of prohibition, we would be a nation of drug-fiends in a quarter of a century. To prove that statement, he takes us

down into Georgia again, and tells us about an increase of 700 per cent. He will have to give us something a trifle more definite than that. It is not the lack of drink, but the taking of a "shot" of something or other the "morning after" to sober up on that forms the drug habit. But let him not worry. The prohibition law recently passed by the National Government will take care of the drug-fiend.

Mr. Maurice questions my statement, "that the majority of men would never think of taking a drink if it wasn't under their nose all the time." Nevertheless, the gospel of prohibition is being spread by drinking men who have made the acquaintance of water in dry territory. He has twisted my statement, "alcohol is made to be sold, and it is going to be sold, law or no law." If it is not made, it will not be sold; but if it is made, "regulations" will not hold it back. I said very plainly to "throw the statistics of the liquor dealers' associations into the waste-basket." He has twisted that statement. If he wishes to get at the force of it, let him read the articles that appeared recently in the *Saturday Evening Post* by William Allen White and a representative of the liquor interests; especially, Mr. White's rejoinder. Here is what Archbishop Ireland says ("The Saloon"):

"The most dreadful fruits of the evil are removed from the observation of the intelligent and orderly classes of society. They reach us only through dry statistics which say but little to us, or through words of temperance advocates, against whom we are more or less prejudiced. There is the power of the traffic which not only misleads public thought by false information, but makes it our interest, social, commercial and political not to discuss or agitate the question."

I have not charged Mr. Maurice with being a friend of the saloon. I grant his honesty of purpose; but he will never make an enemy of the liquor traffic with his "regulation" remedies. Prohibition may not be the best solution of the problem; but it is the best solution I can see at this time. "Regulation," which is about equal parts of talk and theory, having failed, prohibition is defensible "on the ground of public expediency." Archbishop Ireland has said:

"If Catholics everywhere preached and organized a strong and vigorous crusade against intemperance for the short period of

a decade of years, the change would be too bright to attempt to portray. But God wishes it and He begs us to do what we can to bring about that era of peace and love and temperance in this country. If it is not accomplished, it will not be the fault of the weak Catholics, but the fault of those who call themselves strong and who are unwilling to take up the work."

Instead of following the advice of this great apostle of temperance, our "strong" Catholics have either been content to sit by with folded arms, or to busily engage themselves in the difficult feat of trying to balance the intolerable liquor traffic of the United States on the only straw that could be found among the admonitions of the last Council of Baltimore, "not in itself illicit." Arizona is the result.

Omaha.

J. J. FITZGERALD.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

A writer in your esteemed paper for April 24 takes me to task for having said that no priest who celebrates Mass can be a total abstainer. He calls my assertion "reckless." Wherein does the recklessness consist? My critic has for years been connected with a Total Abstinence Union; yet he does not know what total abstinence really means. According to Webster and every other standard dictionary, total abstinence means "the habitual and voluntary refraining from all intoxicating liquors." The priest is bound to use intoxicating wine every time he celebrates Mass. Whether he uses only three spoonfuls of wine or an ordinary glassful of wine, does not make any essential difference. Total abstinence is not determined by the quantity of liquor; it excludes the use of all intoxicating beverages. Would my critic consider the members of his Total Abstinence Union as total abstainers, if they consumed every day a glass of wine? I stand by my assertion until my critic proves that total abstinence does not mean total abstinence. The sneer of my critic at the "mince pie" is a cheap one. It has nothing to do with our question except in the sense that a man may eat too much mince pie just as well as he may drink too much wine. More people die every year from excessive eating than from excessive drinking. Every reliable and experienced physician will be ready to testify to this fact.



My critic has discovered men who "so write and speak on the subject of drink as to raise in not well-informed Protestant minds a suspicion that there must be some sort of necessary connection between rum and Catholicism." Must we cater to "not well-informed Protestant minds"? Not well-informed Protestant minds raised a rumpus against the Catholic Church because she ordained that laymen should receive Holy Communion under the species of bread alone. They called this "a half Sacrament." And now the Protestant minds in the "dry" camp are raising a rumpus against our Church because she commands her priests to use intoxicating wine in the Mass and thus to receive "the whole Sacrament." Consistency is a jewel which certain agitators can not afford to own. And we should accommodate ourselves to the opinions of preachers who change their views like a pair of shoes!

My critic says, further: I. "Even if Federal statistics and court records showed that, on the average and in proportion to the population, there is more drunkenness, vice, crime, misdemeanor, divorce, poverty and insanity in 'dry' territory than in 'wet' territory, it would prove nothing against prohibition as advocated by the party." The "dry" agitators have always and everywhere asserted that prohibition is the only efficacious remedy for drunkenness, vice, crime, misdemeanor, etc. Federal statistics and court records show that the assertion of the "dry" agitators is *false*. They prove a great deal against prohibition, unless we suppose that more drunkenness, crime, vice, misdemeanor, etc., mean a higher degree of morality.

II. "Before prohibition can be judged honestly, it must have an impartial trial for a reasonable time." Prohibition had an impartial trial in Turkey for the reasonable time of thirteen centuries. There it proved a "howling success." The Turks have for the last thirteen centuries been at the tail of culture and civilization, and at the head of brutality, polygamy, fanaticism, immorality, ignorance and poverty. An Oriental proverb thus expresses the wonderful effects of prohibition on the Turks: "The shadow of a Turk makes sterile for a century the ground which it covers." Let my critic prove that the people of "dry" Turkey are healthier, richer, more educated and more moral than the people of "wet" Ireland. Why do our "dry" agitators not

emigrate to Turkey where they can enjoy the "blessings" of prohibition in their fulness?

III. "Country-wide prohibition, which is all that is worth the name, would not increase vice and crime." Witness Turkey where country-wide prohibition reigned for thirteen centuries!

IV. There was "no wine-press in the Garden of Paradise." From which we infer that Adam and Eve fell into sin and dragged the whole human race into ruin, without "a wine-press," when they were perfectly sober. Yet the "dry" agitators make "booze" responsible for nearly all the deviltries in the world. There was, however, prohibition of a certain fruit in the Garden of Paradise, and this first prohibition turned out rather fatal for us!

V. The Israelites in the desert cried for water, not wine, and they got what they wanted.

VI. "Fallen man made wine and at once got drunk on it." Man never made one ounce of wine. Every atom of pure wine is contained in the grape, and the grape is a creature of God. St. Augustine asked the Manicheans who forbade the use of wine: "Why do you not forbid the eating of grapes?" The inspired writer tells us that wine is a creation of God. "Wine was created in the beginning to make man joyful." (Eccl. xxxi, 35.) When Noe got drunk, it was not "the beginning" but the end of him till he "sobered up." God never blamed him for his intoxication; on the contrary, he blessed him and saved his life when there was an abundance of that stuff which the "drys" want us to drink. St. Chrysostom and every Church Father who spoke of wine called wine "a gift of God."

VII. "The alcoholic beverage of the Bible which God allowed is wine, not beer or whiskey." The Israelites used, however, a drink which was much stronger in alcohol than beer and as strong as whiskey. It was called "shekar." And the Lord said: "Give strong drink (shekar) to them that are sad, and wine to them that are grieved in mind." (Proverbs xxxi, 6.)

VIII. "The drink God made was and is water." God made wine and milk as well as water. Milk is more necessary for the sustenance of a man's life than water. A baby can live on milk alone, but not on water alone. More people die every year from drowning than from alcoholism, that is, from the abuse of

alcoholic drinks, and while one person dies from alcoholism, 5,000 persons die from contaminated water. This it is that mortality statistics show.

We do not defend drunkenness. We stand for temperance first, last and always. Temperance is not prohibition. Prohibition is the deadly foe of both temperance and total abstinence as virtues. As a moral factor it proved a lamentable failure everywhere.

Mannington, W. Va.

C. J. KLUSER.

*To the Editor of "America":*

Our lovely critic in Scottdale said in the *Pittsburg Observer* for May 6, 1915, page 2, that the ministers of the Episcopal Church, who in their communion service place the cup of alcoholic wine to the lips of every man and woman, of every boy and girl, are "wolves instead of shepherds." Then he sat down and wrote a letter, telling me how "we must cater to not well-informed Protestant minds, to gain them for Christ, the Good Shepherd." The method of catering to not well-informed Protestant minds and of gaining them for Christ by stigmatizing their ministers as wolves, is new to me. I never employed it, and I am not prepared to employ it in the future. In the early Christian Church Holy Communion was administered under both species to men and women, to boys and girls, even to infants. Pope Gelasius and Pope Leo the Great ordered that the faithful should either receive Holy Communion under both species, or not at all (see "Catholic Encyclopedia," Vol. IV, p. 177). They issued these orders for the purpose of detecting pretended Catholics of the Manichean stripe, who condemned the use of wine.

Our critic introduces to us Bishop Canevin who "said in an address in Cleveland some few years ago that 60,000 die from drink every year in the United States." Congressman Richmond P. Hobson said "some few years ago," in his book "The Great Destroyer," page 9, that in our country "700,000 men are cut off untimely every year by alcohol." The Rev. "Billy" Sunday said "some few years ago" and recently (in Philadelphia) that the number of persons killed in our country every year by alcohol is 600,000. Other "dry" agitators said "some few years ago" that this number is 85,000; others again that it is 40,000. Their

"figures" are anywhere between 10,000 and 700,000. Now, there is Mr. Jason Martin who proves in chapter IX of his recently-published book, "The Fallacy of Prohibition," that "some few years ago," in 1911, the number of deaths from "alcoholism," i.e., from the abuse of alcoholic liquors, was 4,602 in the whole United States and never reached the 5,000 mark. His proof is taken from the United States "Mortality Statistics for 1911," page 59. There is quite a difference between 4,602 and 700,000. God bless the dear souls of our "dry" arithmeticians!! In our younger days when we went to school, 'rithmetics were taught with a hickory stick, and if we poor fellows turned out solutions of an arithmetical problem, which varied between 4,602 and 700,000, the best we could do was to get ready for the reception of a solid spanking. It's a pity that wholesale hickory stick has been relegated to the attic! Bishop Canevin either did not make the assertion, attributed to him, or he was deceived by some "dry" spouter. He never declared and never will declare for state-wide or nation-wide prohibition.

Note that, according to "Mortality Statistics for 1911," pages 59 and 133, the average rate of deaths from alcoholism was 4.9 per 100,000 population and that cities in "dry" States contributed large quotas to the number of 4,602 persons who died from the abuse of alcoholic drinks. The rate of deaths from alcoholism was, for instance, in the cities of "dry" Maine 8.9 per 100,000 population, while the rate of deaths from the same cause in the cities of "wet" Kentucky was only 3.2 per 100,000 population. Is it reasonable to force 100,000 persons on the "water-wagon" because five per cent. of them ruin themselves through the abuse of alcoholic liquors? If it is, sound logic demands that we prohibit first the use of milk and water as beverages. For Dr. Joseph M. Matthews, formerly president of the Kentucky Board of Health, stated recently that "for every death produced by whiskey, there have been 1,000 deaths produced by drinking impure milk, and for every single death produced by whiskey there have been 5,000 deaths from drinking contaminated water" (quoted by J. Martin in chapter IX of his book). This statement is confirmed by United States "Mortality Statistics for 1911." The death-rate from typhoid fever alone, which is caused by impure water, exceeded four times the death rate from alcoholism.

Mannington is in a "dry" State, indeed. We are supposed to have "the most drastic prohibition law." But to judge from the number of "jolly fellows" who stagger along the streets of our cities, particularly on Saturdays, there are no signs of an excessive drought hereabouts. Of course, a man can not buy a glass of beer in a decent place, neither can he have it imported from another State. But if he visits one of our "speak easies" and owns the necessary coin, he can get all the "firewater" he wants and more than he needs. Our Tax Commissioner, Fred Blue, will die of the blues long before he succeeds in enforcing our "drastic prohibition law." The stupidity of our "dry" agitators reached its climax when they thought that they could wipe out men's appetite for alcoholic drinks simply by "rolling up" a large vote for the prohibition amendment. You can vote a State "dry," but you can not vote the people of a State "dry."

Our critic guessed well when he said that "fibbing may be one of the vices increased by prohibition." Prohibition breeds here, like everywhere else, hypocrites, sneaks, liars, "dope-fiends," "boot-leggers" and drunkards. The increase of this crowd is the punishment we justly deserve for having attempted to "amend" the divine law that allows the moderate use of alcoholic liquors. But the time will come sooner or later when the people of West Virginia will shake off the Turkish yoke of prohibition. I stand for licensed and properly conducted saloons, instead of for "unlicensed saloons" which are veritable hell-holes. Not drink, but the abuse of drink, causes a number of evils. Men must be blamed for the abuse. To make things responsible for evils that are in reality caused by men themselves, is rank idiocy.

Mannington, W. Va.

C. J. KLUSER.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

If any question monopolizes the attention of our day, it is the problem revolving about the liquor traffic. This problem remains in spite of centuries of legislative effort a tacit testimony which reinforces the statement that physical remedies and external coercion will not cure moral disorders, however much they may lessen the incidence of temptation. Hence moral suasion and religion which alone strengthen the will, are the only adequate and safe remedy. Still we find a large number of social

reformers offering panaceas, but all in vain. One of these so-called reformers is comprehended under the policy of prohibition which attempts the solution of the problem by preventing the manufacture, sale and use of liquor. All who have investigated the drink problem fully realize the gravity of its nature and unhesitatingly admit the prevalent abuses and also the urgent need of reform, but the notion that prohibition is the solution of the problem is not seconded by the majority. Still we find many well-meaning people among prohibitionists, who have been lured into the meshes of this charlatanism by the fair promises of a utopia. Many of these people would not adhere to strict prohibition if they knew what it stands for. That "little thinking is done to-day" is no mere "saw." Its truth is manifested in all walks of life and especially in our legislation, where love of extremes seems to be a chief characteristic. People to-day do not think. They allow themselves to be duped by any nostrum that gains any prominence. It is not my purpose to unmask the many errors of this so-called reform movement, but only to review some wild assertions and distorted views which seem to have gained much undeserved vogue of late. That the prohibitionist is an extremist is inevitable; for, he condemns wine as a *malum per se*. But is not every atom of wine contained in the grape? And is not the grape a creature of God? "Wine was created in the beginning to make men jovial." St. Chrysostom and other Fathers of the Church called wine "a gift of God." But the prohibitionist maintains that it is concocted by human depravity inspired by the devil.

This proves that the prohibitionist is an extremist. But what is the aim of prohibition? To suppress the drink vice. Did you ever hear of man suppressing vice? That is something divine and can not be usurped by man. Yet this is the very aim of prohibition. The prohibitionists would correct the liquor evil by destroying liquor itself. Did you ever hear of a reform movement that destroys the thing in question? It sounds like Socialism, attempting to reform society by destroying it. Again many who call themselves prohibitionists are only restrictionists. For instance, the Catholic prohibitionist is not a strict prohibitionist, but only a restrictionist. When he preaches prohibition he means restriction. The Hobson Resolution is not prohibition, because

it allows the "manufacture, sale, importation and transportation of liquors for sacramental, medicinal and pharmaceutical purposes." Kansas is not a prohibition State because it exempts "medicinal and scientific purposes." Maine is far less a prohibition State because it permits the "manufacture and sale of hard cider." The radical prohibitionist would brush away all these exemptions. But why say that the two so-called banner prohibition States, Maine and Kansas are not prohibition? Mr. Cyrus W. Davis, Secretary of State of Maine, and Hon. Royal E. Cabell, in their pamphlet, "The Two Banner Prohibition States," prove very conclusively that neither Maine nor Kansas are prohibition States. Mr. Davis says, "Maine has never been or never will be a prohibition State until public opinion precedes legal enactment: Maine is a temperate State," while in Kansas, in which the sale of liquor is prohibited for all purposes excepting the aforesaid, there were registered for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, 733 persons qualified under the Federal Laws to retail liquors; while in the license State of Arkansas, only 873 qualified under the Federal Laws. Now, let us see what prohibition has done for Kansas, in the way of social betterment. If prohibition prevents suicide, why is the suicide rate in Kansas higher than in twenty-one States in which liquor is legally sold? If prohibition prevents insanity, why is the rate of insanity in Kansas higher than in sixteen States in which liquor is lawfully sold, and why should it cost nearly one million dollars annually to care for the insane, etc.? If prohibition prevents pauperism, why is the pauper rate in Kansas higher than the pauper rate in ten States where liquor is lawfully sold? Don't talk about prohibition blessings in Kansas. Among the States that have had quasi-prohibition we find that Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Michigan, Iowa, Illinois, Nebraska, Pennsylvania and South Dakota have abandoned prohibition for license. This goes to show that prohibition has been a rather disastrous experiment where it has reposed on the statute books.

The solution of the drink problem is still in its experimental stage and will probably continue so indefinitely on account of the conflicting theories and psychological differences in our heterogeneous population. For the present let us stay off this prohibition wave and adopt strict external regulation, scientific and

religious education and above all, total abstinence on the part of our moral leaders. Would that humanity were one vast total abstinence society of voluntary profession, not by the tyranny of law! Until these means have accomplished personal temperance on the part of our people, prohibition can not be enforced; when they have accomplished it, prohibition will be unnecessary.

St. Francis, Wis.

J. J. ROCHE.

---

*To the Editor of "America":*

It is with a good deal of surprise that I have read the communications in *America* which have taken a decidedly anti-prohibition stand; but I attribute the attitude of the writers to the fact that they have not been brought into actual contact with the misery that results from the liquor traffic. They have come from good families and have lived in good homes, and have had good, honest, sober, devoted fathers. Such men are not fitted by actual experience to sympathize with those whose homes have been cursed by drunkenness. I should like to see an article written straight from the heart of one of those many wives, whose happiness has been wrecked, whose children's prospects have been blasted, and whose homes, which should be the cradle and the sanctuary of all that is holy, have been turned into places of torment and have been the unwilling witnesses of many outrages against God's law. They and they alone know how much prohibition is needed. What an indictment against strong drink would the records of our prisons, asylums and poor-houses bring, if they were but known. Nation-wide prohibition is a crying need. Catholics should not oppose, but support the movement.

Rhineland, Wis.

M. STAPLETON.

## EUROPEAN ALCOHOLISM

BY AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M.D.

IT is a common notion among amateurs in social science that if our people would suppress the use of distilled alcoholic liquors and substitute the drinking of



wine or beer, we should happily solve the intemperance question at once, and at the same time keep up the revenue for governmental needs. Italy and France, they say, drink wine and are sober; Germany and Austria drink beer and are sober. They are not sober; they are chronically pickled in alcohol. France is twice as drunken as England. In these States, as everywhere else, the expenditure by the Government because of the results of alcoholism immeasurably exceed the revenue from the tax on alcoholic beverages.

Luigi Luzzatti, who was the Italian premier, in submitting a bill recently for the reduction of intemperance, brought together evidence which proves that while the general deathrate in Italy is falling, the mortality from alcoholism is increasing; and, secondly, that the drinking of wine and beer has not decreased drunkenness, lessened crime and poverty, or the insanity brought on by alcoholism.

Dr. Antonini, a superintendent of one of the leading Italian insane asylums, said, a few years ago [*Archivio di Psichiatria*]: "The hospitals and insane asylums (of Italy) are filled with alcoholic patients; tuberculosis worsened by alcoholism is spreading everywhere; pellagra is spread by alcoholic degeneracy; crime is becoming more frequent among the young; the suicides are countless; the people are steadily growing weaker physically and morally." This sounds like oratorical exaggeration, but several other Italian delegates at the International Congress on Alcoholism in Milan, in 1913, gave the same testimony. Falconi, the Italian Minister of State, said that deaths from alcoholism in Italy had trebled since 1889.

Cardinal Mercier, the Archbishop of Mechlin, is one

of the most zealous anti-alcoholic workers of Europe, because his own people in Belgium suffer so much from alcoholism. His address on this subject, delivered at Liège, December 20, 1908, is one of the best articles of its kind written. Another address, delivered before the Belgian National Anti-alcoholic Congress in Brussels, June 26, 1910, is supplementary to his conference at Liège. He gives some notable statistics: in 1910 there were 211,617 liquor shops in Belgium—one for every thirty-four inhabitants in the nation. One blessing of the war is that very many of these have been destroyed. The Belgians spent daily 550,000 francs for alcoholic liquor. There were annually 20,000 deaths and 800,000 cases of pauperism from alcoholism in that little kingdom; seventy-five per cent. of the judicial convictions and fifty per cent. of the suicides were caused by alcohol. The Cardinal says the Danes drink relatively more distilled liquors than any people in Europe, and the Belgians come next; but the Belgians drink more beer proportionately than any other nation in Europe.

The French consume more alcohol in general than any other people in the world—they drink twice as much distilled liquor per capita as the people of Great Britain [*Brewing Trades Review*, 1911]. There were 355,000 liquor shops in France in 1881, and 480,000 in 1911—three saloons to one bake-shop. "But one-half-penny's worth of bread to this intolerable deal of sack!" In a stationary population French insanity has increased from 47,000 to 700,000 cases. There is a strong anti-alcoholic national league in France, and sad need for it. Bishop Turinez, of Nancy; Bishop Latty, of Avignon, and Fathers Ract, Gibier Perrot and others have written vig-

orous pastorals or books on the subject of French alcoholism.

Dr. M. G. Bunge, professor of physiological chemistry at Basle, in 1893, estimated from Government statistics, that *one-fifth* of the commercial activity of the entire German people was at that time totally expended in the production and sale of alcoholic beverages. A great many officers in the German army and navy are total abstainers, owing to the Kaiser's urging. Russia has prohibited the sale of distilled liquors during the war; France has stopped the use of absinthe, and England has been threatening to tear herself away from her whiskey and soda. When, however, the Emperor William's address against alcohol, delivered at Mürvik, in 1910, was sent by a temperance league of Germany to 2,400 newspapers, less than 350 noticed it at all, some of these doubted its genuineness, and others altered its meaning.

Professor Adolph von Strümpf, of Leipzig, holds that "Nothing is more erroneous, from the physician's standpoint, than to think of diminishing the destructive effects of alcoholism by substituting beer for other alcoholic drinks." In Munich one hospital death in every sixteen is from beer-drinker's heart; yet Lord Beaconsfield called beer "liquid bread." One loaf of bread has the food value of exactly one yard of filled beer steins, and the cost in many ways is much less.

These statistics, which do not scratch the surface, make it doubtful that Germans, Italians and other Europeans may drink alcohol at meals because "they have always been accustomed to do so." No matter what they may be able to do, it is certain that northern European races in America may not drink alcohol habitually.

of the most zealous anti-alcoholic workers of Europe, because his own people in Belgium suffer so much from alcoholism. His address on this subject, delivered at Liège, December 20, 1908, is one of the best articles of its kind written. Another address, delivered before the Belgian National Anti-alcoholic Congress in Brussels, June 26, 1910, is supplementary to his conference at Liège. He gives some notable statistics: in 1910 there were 211,617 liquor shops in Belgium—one for every thirty-four inhabitants in the nation. One blessing of the war is that very many of these have been destroyed. The Belgians spent daily 550,000 francs for alcoholic liquor. There were annually 20,000 deaths and 800,000 cases of pauperism from alcoholism in that little kingdom; seventy-five per cent. of the judicial convictions and fifty per cent. of the suicides were caused by alcohol. The Cardinal says the Danes drink relatively more distilled liquors than any people in Europe, and the Belgians come next; but the Belgians drink more beer proportionately than any other nation in Europe.

The French consume more alcohol in general than any other people in the world—they drink twice as much distilled liquor per capita as the people of Great Britain [*Brewing Trades Review*, 1911]. There were 355,000 liquor shops in France in 1881, and 480,000 in 1911—three saloons to one bake-shop. "But one-half-penny's worth of bread to this intolerable deal of sack!" In a stationary population French insanity has increased from 47,000 to 700,000 cases. There is a strong anti-alcoholic national league in France, and sad need for it. Bishop Turinez, of Nancy; Bishop Latty, of Avignon, and Fathers Ract, Gibier Perrot and others have written vig-

orous pastorals or books on the subject of French alcoholism.

Dr. M. G. Bunge, professor of physiological chemistry at Basle, in 1893, estimated from Government statistics, that *one-fifth* of the commercial activity of the entire German people was at that time totally expended in the production and sale of alcoholic beverages. A great many officers in the German army and navy are total abstainers, owing to the Kaiser's urging. Russia has prohibited the sale of distilled liquors during the war; France has stopped the use of absinthe, and England has been threatening to tear herself away from her whiskey and soda. When, however, the Emperor William's address against alcohol, delivered at Mürvik, in 1910, was sent by a temperance league of Germany to 2,400 newspapers, less than 350 noticed it at all, some of these doubted its genuineness, and others altered its meaning.

Professor Adolph von Strümpf, of Leipzig, holds that "Nothing is more erroneous, from the physician's standpoint, than to think of diminishing the destructive effects of alcoholism by substituting beer for other alcoholic drinks." In Munich one hospital death in every sixteen is from beer-drinker's heart; yet Lord Beaconsfield called beer "liquid bread." One loaf of bread has the food value of exactly one yard of filled beer steins, and the cost in many ways is much less.

These statistics, which do not scratch the surface, make it doubtful that Germans, Italians and other Europeans may drink alcohol at meals because "they have always been accustomed to do so." No matter what they may be able to do, it is certain that northern European races in America may not drink alcohol habitually.

All investigators are unanimous in holding that *half* the crime of the civilized world is due to alcohol, and it is worth while to cut down this toll to hell, no matter what braying is on the wind from those who "know when to leave drink alone."

The only way to leave it alone is to leave it out, as Cardinal Mercier said; and this holds for Germans and Italians as well as for Irishmen. Wars start in avarice, but the sins of peace are also alcoholic. Here in the United States just now there is not a little fanaticism mixed with the attack on alcoholism, but the attack itself is good. It is to be regretted that Catholics are inclined to hold aloof in this fight, not through love for alcohol, but because bigots and canting preachers have made a new religion, that consists in twisting the tail of the "Demon Rum." If we will vote for the gang, we should at least spread the devotion instituted by Pius X, of holy memory, who in 1904 granted an indulgence to any one who abstains from alcoholic drink for the present day and says the prayer:

God, my Father, to show my love for Thee, to repair Thine injured honor, to obtain the salvation of souls, I firmly determine not to drink wine, beer, or any inebriating drink to-day. I offer Thee this mortification in union with the sacrifice of Thy Son Jesus Christ, Who daily to Thy glory immolates Himself on the altar. Amen.

Pius X was an Italian who did not think alcohol good for the people, and Leo XIII was of the same opinion, as he wrote to Archbishop Ireland.